

*Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park
Park Advisory Commission Meeting*

January 18, 2007

Middletown Town Hall
Middletown, Virginia

Agenda

- I) General Introductions
- II) Review and Approval of Minutes from 16 November 2006 (10 minutes)
- III) Park landowners forum to be held 22 January 2007 (15 minutes)
- IV) GMP Status Update (10 minutes)
- V) GMP alternatives and Park zoning; presentation and group discussion
- VI) Old Business
- VII) New Business
- VIII) Next Meeting – 15 March 2007 in Front Royal at the Warren County Govt. Center

Meeting Notes

Commission members in attendance: Diann Jacox, Designated Federal Official (DFO); Mary Bowser, Chairperson; Elizabeth McClung; Howard Kittell; Gene Dicks; Jim Smalls; Fred Andreae; Dan Stickley; Kris Tierney; Gary Rinkerman; Patrick Farris

Commission members absent: Randolph Jones; Roy Downey

Others in attendance: Chris Stubbs, NPS; Tom Price, Shenandoah County; Sarah Mauck, Town of Strasburg; Becky Krystal, Northern Virginia Daily; Randy Orndorff

Chairperson Mary Bowser chaired the meeting.

The notes from the 16 November 2006 meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

There was a discussion of the upcoming Park Landowner's Forum, to be held on Jan. 22, with a snow date of Jan. 25, at Lord Fairfax Community College. The purpose of the forum is to educate private landowners within the park about conservation tools. Commissioners Diann Jacox, Howard Kittell, and Elizabeth McClung briefed the rest of the group on the background and importance of this meeting. All Commissioners were invited to attend and participate.

Chris Stubbs of the National Park Service provided a general management plan status update to the Commission, the details of which were handed out to the Commissioners

and the public. A central point of the presentation was that the National Park Service intends to send out a public newsletter that outlines the draft GMP alternatives.

There was a presentation and facilitated discussion from Mr. Stubbs on the draft GMP alternatives and proposed park zones. A hard copy of the latest version of the draft alternatives was provided to the Commissioners. A summary of the discussion that occurred during the presentation is appended to these commission notes.

There was no new or old business discussed.

The next meeting will be on 15 March 2007 in Front Royal at the Warren County Govt. Center.

With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Bowser.

After the meeting adjourned, Commissioner Jim Smalls, District Ranger for the Lee Ranger District of the George Washington National Forest, provided the group with a brief presentation on the current National Forest planning process. The current George Washington National Forest plan is being revised, and the public is invited to be involved in the process. There will be a public meeting on the Forest Plan on March 7 from 7:00-10:00 p.m. in Woodstock, VA. Inquiries may be directed to the Lee Ranger District at (540) 984-4101.

List of handouts provided at 18 January 2007 meeting

1. Meeting agenda
2. Minutes from 16 November 2006 Commission meeting
3. GMP status update
4. Draft Alternatives paper, dated January 18, 2007

Appendix I – Discussion of Draft GMP Alternatives (18 January 2007 Version) and Proposed Park Zones

- Specific wording changes to the draft alternatives were proposed by the Commissioners. This input was noted and changes have been made to the document.
- There was a lengthy discussion of private landowner rights. The consensus was that every effort must be made to ensure private landowners that their rights will not be altered, changed, or decreased as a result of the GMP alternatives or the proposed park zones.
- As stated before, the GMP must have a definitions section, and the definition of “Park” must be clearly spelled out.
- The alternatives must say that the existing contact facilities will remain open.
- There was a discussion of horse trails and a general consensus that the Park is not big enough to have the infrastructure needed to accommodate equestrian facilities. The Commissioners agreed that the alternatives should not call for a horse trail system.

- The alternatives must state that any land acquisition would be done with willing sellers only.
- The alternatives should state that in those cases where visitor interpretation would occur on private land, the landowner must be a willing participant in the program.
- There was a discussion of whether the trail that follows the course of the battle in Alternatives C and D should be mentioned specifically. It was stated by Mr. Stubbs that many people asked for such a trail during public scoping. The question was also raised about whether other trails should be mentioned specifically by name in the alternatives.
- Regarding the park zones, it was recommended that we use the term “zone” and “park zones”, and not use the term “zoning”. “Zoning” implies regulatory action and the public may misconstrue this word.
- Some questions were raised about the proposed zones:
 - Should Harmony Hall be added to the visitor services zone?
 - Should the Keister Tract be added to the large events zone to accommodate county festivals?
 - Should we provide a definition of “visitor contact facility” and “visitor center”? Is there a difference between the two?